DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 315 339 SO 020 508

TITLE UN Peacemaking and Peacekeeping. Report of the United Nations Issues Conference (20th, Harriman, New York, February 24-26, 1989).
INSTITUTION Stanley Foundation, Muscatine, Iowa.
PUB DATE Feb 89
NOTE 28p.; For related documents, see ED 314 357-359 and SO 020 506. Photographs will film poorly.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Conflict; *Conflict Resolution; Economics; Foreign Countries; Futures (of Society); Global Approach; International Cooperation; *International Organizations; *International Relations; *Peace; Planning
IDENTIFIERS *United Nations

ABSTRACT

The United Nations (UN) enjoyed a renewed prominence in the international spotlight during 1988 as the world recognized UN successes in the areas of peacemaking and peacekeeping. Conference participants agreed that the lessening of tensions between the superpowers has had a very positive impact on the general international political atmosphere. Other factors may have contributed to the UN's accomplishments as well: conflicts were, perhaps, winding down of their own weight or, perhaps, the world is entering a new era of greater peace. To clarify how the UN goes about resolving conflicts, the participants distinguished between peacemaking and peacekeeping activities. Peacemaking is generally thought to be the full range of activities aimed at ameliorating conflicts between nations. Suggestions to strengthen the UN peacemaking role included early intervention and a more assertive stance by the Security Council. Participants gave the Secretary-General much credit for recent peacemaking advances and supported his continued efforts. Often a peacekeeping force is deployed after the first stages of peacemaking have succeeded. Some participants favored overhauling the operational aspects of peacekeeping. Others favored fine-tuning the system. As for the future UN role in peacemaking and peacekeeping, the participants discussed ways of preventing conflicts, how the international community might respond more effectively to massive human rights violations, and how to protect citizens and diplomats who travel internationally. A list of conference participants and the conference-opening address are included. (Author/JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED315339

UN Peacemaking and Peacekeeping

20th UN Issues Conference
1989

The Stanley Foundation

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Kathleen Christensen
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SO 020 548

2

Convened at Arden House, Harriman, New York

The Stanley Foundation encourages use of this report for educational purposes. Any part of the material may be duplicated with proper acknowledgement. Additional copies are available.

ISSN 0743-9180

UN Peacemaking and Peacekeeping

Report of the Twentieth United Nations Issues Conference

Sponsored by
The Stanley Foundation

February 24-26, 1989

Executive Summary

Over the past year, the United Nations has enjoyed a renewed prominence in the international spotlight. The world has recognized in particular UN successes in the areas of peacemaking and peacekeeping. Out of fourteen peacekeeping operations during the United Nations' forty-year history, four were deployed in the last twelve months in Afghanistan, Angola, Namibia, and Iran/Iraq. In addition, the 1988 Nobel Peace Prize went to the United Nations' peacekeeping forces. The participants at this conference considered why these peacemaking and peacekeeping efforts have been successful at this time and what the United Nations can do to further this trend.

All agreed that the lessening of tensions between the superpowers has had a very positive impact on the general international political atmosphere; when the superpowers are in agreement, things happen.

Other factors may have contributed to the United Nations' accomplishments as well. Perhaps the aforementioned conflicts were

winding down of their own weight. Perhaps the world is entering a new era in which nations are beginning to realize the futility of relying on individual strength. Each situation required a different approach, and the UN role in each was critical to the outcome of the conflicts.

To clarify how the United Nations goes about resolving conflicts, the participants distinguished between UN "peacemaking" and "peacekeeping" activities. Peacemaking is generally thought to be the full range of activities aimed at ameliorating conflicts between nations. Suggestions to strengthen the United Nations' peacemaking role included early intervention to prevent disputes from erupting into open conflict. Others at the conference favored a more assertive stance by the Security Council, especially since the five permanent members of that body (the United States, the Soviet Union, China, Great Britain, and France) carry so much weight in the world.

Participants gave the Secretary-General much credit for recent peacemaking advances. They recognized the difficulties facing the Secretary-General, whose office is understaffed, and who must quietly carry out his diplomacy even though his task requires gathering and exchanging massive amounts of information. Despite these problems, the group emphasized their support of the Secretary-General and their desire for him to continue aggressively finding ways to bring conflicts to a peaceful resolution.

Peacemaking and peacekeeping often go hand in hand. Many times a peacekeeping force is deployed after the first stages of peacemaking have succeeded. While the number of peacekeeping operations in the world increased dramatically during the past year, numerous problems still need attention.

Some participants favored overhauling the operational aspects of peacekeeping. They envisioned the Military Staff Committee (comprised of military leaders from the five permanent members of the Security Council) revitalized; they want the special accounts formula for funding peacekeeping reexamined; and they would like more nations' forces used in peacekeeping operations.

Other conference participants simply favored fine-tuning the peacekeeping system, arguing that the present system is basically sound. They agreed that something must be done about how UN-member countries divide peacekeeping costs, especially since the

United Nations is nearly eight years behind in paying for some operations, and troop-contributing countries may be losing their patience with the United Nations. (The General Assembly has already recognized the financing problem and has asked the Secretary- General for a report outlining possible options.)

Most participants were less willing to consider a move toward more universal participation in peacekeeping operations. They felt the Military Staff Committee has not been needed so far, noting that much of the world is uneasy when the five major powers act together in a military operation. Others pointed out that the traditional practice of not putting troops from the major powers in volatile situations has worked out well.

Even though the participants differed on how to improve the peacekeeping system, they generally agreed that the operations have been successful so far and that there is no need to radically alter them at this time.

As for the future UN role in peacemaking and peacekeeping, the participants discussed: ways of preventing conflicts, how the international community might respond more effectively to massive human rights violations, and how to protect citizens and diplomats who travel internationally. They projected an increased use of peacekeeping forces in the future, which has its own problems--particularly in terms of the cost. Also, as the number of peacekeeping operations increases, some may fail. But, it was noted, the United Nations should be allowed to fail sometimes without the danger of abandoning the entire process.

Great potential exists for the United Nations to become the dispute-settling arena. Success builds upon success, and the United Nations should capitalize on the momentum it has gained during the past year. To achieve this goal, the participants agreed, the United Nations needs the international political climate to continue to improve, and it needs to continue to bring together the three essential elements for successful peacemaking: skilled personnel, timely information, and accommodating conditions.

Differences over how the United Nations should adjust to its rejuvenated status in the world are not insurmountable. As the United Nations evolves, it is hoped that a peaceful resolution of disputes will become the norm of international behavior.

Participants

Conference Chairman
Richard H. Stanley, President, The Stanley Foundation

Rapporteurs
Anita DeKock, Project Coordinator, The Stanley Foundation
Jeffrey G. Martin, Vice President, The Stanley Foundation

Participants
Sverre J. Bergh Johansen, Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Norway to the United Nations

Felix C. Downes-Thomas, Senior Political Officer, Office for Special Political Affairs, United Nations

Orobola Fasehun, Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Nigeria to the United Nations

Robert Michael Finley, Deputy Chief of Staff, US House Committee on Foreign Affairs

John D. Fox, Managing Director, UN System Administration, Bureau of International Organization Affairs, US Department of State

Ulrich Kalbitzer, Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany to the United Nations

Richard Kinchen, Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom to the United Nations

Bruce MacDonald, Legislative Assistant, Office of US Senator Dale Bumpers

Jerome J. Martin, Former Liaison Officer, UN Military Staff Committee

Giovanni Migliuolo, Permanent Representative of Italy to the United Nations

Susan R. Mills, Deputy Controller, Office of Programme Planning, Budget and Finance, United Nations

W. Alexander Morrison, Minister-Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Canada to the United Nations

Rogelio F. E. Pfirter, Deputy Permanent Representative, Minister, Permanent Mission of Argentina to the United Nations

Robert B. Rosenstock, Counsellor, United States Mission to the United Nations

Sergey N. Smirnov, Deputy Permanent Representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the United Nations

N. Shaw Smith, Deputy Assistant US Secretary of State for United Nations Political Affairs, Bureau of International Organization Affairs, Department of State

Wang Guangya, Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations

Stanley Foundation Conference Staff
Carol Matthews, Conference Coordinator
Mary Gray, Producer, *Common Ground*

Affiliations are listed for identification purposes only. Participants attended as individuals rather than as representatives of their governments or organizations.

Opening Remarks

Richard H. Stanley
President, The Stanley Foundation

As recently as two years ago hardly anyone would have predicted the need for discussion on political and financial support for the United Nations' work in peacemaking and peacekeeping. International political tensions were high, and a host of regional conflicts were dragging on with little hope of resolution or even de-escalation. The United Nations' role in peacemaking--or perhaps it would be more accurate to say the process of peacemaking embodied in the United Nations--was considered marginal. The United Nations was seen as a minor actor on the world stage, essentially a failure at its primary purpose of preventing the scourge of war.

That view made 1988 all the more surprising. In 1988 politicians and commentators talked and wrote about an outbreak of peace in the world. While that is certainly an exaggeration, it was inspired by a series of real breakthroughs. The Soviet agreement to withdraw from Afghanistan, the cease-fire in the Iran/Iraq War, the agreement on Angola and Namibia, and the mounting prospects for a settlement in Western Sahara made 1988 probably the most successful year for peacemaking in UN history. The United Nations' role in each of those conflict settlements was different, but in each case the United Nations' effort was an essential element. What happened to change the scene so suddenly? Did the United Nations and the world just get lucky last year?

Defining Luck

I think we did get lucky if you will accept a definition of luck borrowed from a former US baseball player. Lou Brock, who was famous for stealing bases, was asked by a journalist if he was simply lucky not to get caught more often. He answered that he

would consider it luck if luck was defined as that moment when preparation met opportunity. In the past eighteen to twenty-four months the international political climate has improved, led by the lessening of tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union. Without that improvement none of last year's achievements would have been possible. It provided a great opportunity. But it is also true that years of preparation by the United Nations were equally essential to the real progress that has been made.

In Afghanistan, UN mediators labored for years to find a solution that would allow Afghan people to choose their own government. A change in Soviet foreign policy made progress possible, but the UN-mediated talks provided a ready venue for reaching an agreement by which Soviet forces have withdrawn. Unfortunately, war rages on in Afghanistan, but at least the situation is no longer complicated by the presence of a large number of forces from a superpower.

In the Persian Gulf, UN mediators again worked for eight years before a cease-fire was agreed upon last August. That cease-fire could come about only when the two warring parties reassessed their national interests and saw the benefit in ceasing hostilities. However, they needed a face-saving way to end the conflict. The United Nations was there to provide that role, and the fighting was ended in large part because of the efforts of the Secretary-General and the positions taken by the Security Council. Here was an example of the policies of individual nations complementing the collective position of nations taken in an intergovernmental body working in concert with skillful mediation efforts. Again, the preparation had been done before the opportunity arose.

In the Angola-Namibia situation the United States, rather than the United Nations, was the mediator. But the talks were premised on the need for the implementation of Security Council Resolution 435 which provides the framework for a peace settlement and the establishment of Namibia's independence. Again, a prepared United Nations was a vital element in the success.

Guerrilla warfare in the Western Sahara has gone on for years. And for years the United Nations has tried to mediate the dispute. Now, again spurred by a changing political situation, that persistence and preparation stand a chance of paying off. This is a good start. The world needs much more of this kind of luck.

Many more challenges await us. How can the international community encourage new opportunities for peacemaking and peacekeeping? And what actions are needed to be certain that the international community and our international institutions are fully prepared to meet these opportunities?

Necessary Support

Progress on nearly any international conflict requires a mix of unilateral, bilateral, and multilateral actions. The policies of individual governments often are significant, especially if they are powerful nations. Bilateral agreements can make a major difference. What has not been as readily accepted throughout history is the contribution that multilateral action can make. The United Nations is this century's second great experiment in formal multilateral efforts to alleviate international conflicts; and not long ago, many were ready to write off the experiment as another failure. The past year's experience should dispel that notion. The United Nations is the world's premier peacemaking body.

However, if it is to remain dynamic, member nations will need to reaffirm their support for the United Nations' work and to put substance behind rhetoric. In plain terms that means concrete political support for UN efforts and money to support UN operations.

Clear-eyed national leaders do not freely throw around political or financial support. They need to know that the political and monetary capital they provide is used wisely. That is why we must examine the operations of the United Nations in the peacemaking and peacekeeping areas.

Why have recent peacemaking efforts succeeded? Might the processes be strengthened so that nations look to them more often and peaceful reconciliation of disputes becomes more of an international norm of behavior? Is the consultation process between the Secretary-General and the Security Council functioning effectively? Can it be improved? The human and financial resources available to the Secretary-General to carry out the many missions of his Good Offices are stretched very thin. What resources are needed and how can they be assured? When the United Nations is not directly involved in mediating a dispute, are communications between the mediators and the United Nations sufficient so that the United Nations can play an effective supporting role? These are some of the questions that should be addressed.

Peacekeeping forces and observer missions are increasingly used as elements in settlements of regional conflicts. Each of the four conflicts mentioned earlier has one or more missions assigned to it as a part of a peace settlement. Several others remain in place in the Middle East, Cyprus, and South Asia. Real prospects exist for forces in Western Sahara, Southeast Asia, and Central America and for expanded operations in the Persian Gulf.

The United Nations carries out these operations very well. Therefore, it is more than a little ironic that as the use of these forces has become more diplomatically popular, some governments have become less willing to pay for them. Governments have a right to make certain that forces are not unnecessarily large and that the funds are used efficiently. But there is also a need to make sure that the forces are of sufficient size and composition to have a reasonable expectation of achieving the defined mission.

As new forces are put into place, the costs are expected to rise quite dramatically. This raises questions about how best to pay for them. How should costs be divided up among governments? Should they be assessed or made as voluntary contributions? Should they be divided up among governments at all? Might some kind of tax be a better solution?

The costs of these forces also need to be kept in perspective. Even if they swell to as much as one to two billion dollars per year, as some have suggested they might, that expenditure is still a tiny fraction of the nearly one trillion dollars that the nations of the world spend on preparing for war. In the United States, for example, three of the proposed Stealth bombers would cover the entire estimated cost.

New Opportunities

The current political climate, the United Nations' recent successes, and its continuing efforts on a number of disputes combine to provide an opportunity for strengthening the practices of peacemaking and peacekeeping and making them a more routine part of the conduct of international relations. Unfortunately, the world is not at peace. It is merely less at war. The opportunity for strengthening peacemaking and peacekeeping must not be missed. But it easily could be if there is not sufficient support.

In a sense, the problems are happy problems because they arise out of the urgent call for the United Nations to effectively expand

its ability to execute operations that promote peace and security in the world. We need to keep that in perspective because it is too easy to focus only on the obstacles and problems and not to reflect on the achievements.

Much credit should go to diplomats and international civil servants who have labored many years without seeming to have achieved success but who persisted nevertheless. Special recognition should go to the Secretary-General who has doggedly pursued negotiations on situations that many people had considered hopeless. Credit should also go to government leaders for taking initiatives that have eased world tensions. In this regard, special attention should be given to the leaders of the United States and Soviet Union who have worked to improve their relationship. If it is fair to criticize the superpowers when they are at each other's throat and world tensions are high, then it is also fair to laud their efforts at *rapprochement*.

There is good reason to be pleased, but we dare not be satisfied. Unprecedented opportunities exist for an even greater and more effective role for the United Nations in peacemaking and peacekeeping. Let us build upon the successes of today to further enhance the opportunities and preparation for tomorrow. If we do this, perhaps the world's good fortune can continue.

Rapporteurs DeKock and Martin

UN Peacemaking and Peacekeeping: Political and Financial Support

Participants agreed: something has changed. During the last forty years, the United Nations has engaged in only fourteen peacekeeping operations. Yet in the last twelve months, four new operations have begun in Afghanistan, Angola, Namibia, and Iran/Iraq. And the likelihood of UN involvement in conflicts in other parts of the world has increased greatly. Why the dramatic growth in UN peacekeeping efforts? Who or what is responsible for what appears to be the sudden, or at least revitalized, interest in using the United Nations?

Participants were divided on how much credit is due the United Nations for ending the aforementioned disputes. All observed that improved East-West relations have had a very positive impact on the general international political atmosphere. Both East and West have made moves to relax tensions; and when the superpowers are in agreement, things happen. Another suggested contributing factor was what one participant termed the "era of the long sigh." In several cases conflicts were winding down of

The rapporteurs prepared this report following the conference. It contains their interpretation of the proceedings and is not merely a descriptive, chronological account. Participants neither reviewed nor approved the report. Therefore, it should not be assumed that every participant subscribes to all recommendations, observations, and conclusions.

their own weight. The toll in human and economic terms had finally reached the point where leaders were ready to stop the fighting. The United Nations was approached, a force was put into place, fighting ceased, and everyone gave a long sigh.

The most optimistic might conclude that increased reliance on dispute resolution rather than armed conflict is because the world is entering a stage when nations realize the futility of reliance on individual strength and are beginning to accept the rule of law. Most agreed that willingness to accept UN involvement as part of a peacemaking process was likely a result of all of the above and a measure of luck as well.

Participants agreed that it would be impossible to draw conclusions for future use based on the experiences in Afghanistan, Iran/Iraq, and southwestern Africa. Each situation differed in origin, development, and conclusion. In each, the UN role was unique. Yet all agreed that UN involvement was extremely important to the outcome in each case. Questions of credit or responsibility aside, the United Nations successfully took advantage of current conditions to use its very real influence and peacemaking skills to help make several extremely unsatisfactory situations significantly less unsatisfactory.

It is too early to know if recent events mark the beginning of a trend toward increased use of the United Nations in peacemaking and, if so, whether that trend is likely to continue. It may be that the United Nations has simply been prepared to take advantage of conditions that were favorable--such as improved East-West relations, which the United Nations does not control. All agreed, however, that success breeds success. Each time the United Nations is able to play a part in ending hostilities between nations, the likelihood of its being approached to help in other situations increases. Therefore, participants turned their attention to ways that the United Nations might increase the likelihood of its use and further develop its own capacity for participating in peacemaking.

Peacemaking

What, in the UN context, is meant by *peacemaking*? Most agreed that peacemaking is the full range of activities aimed at ameliorating conflicts between nations. It includes everything from prevention of potential conflicts to activities designed to halt open hostil-

ities (which often may involve the introduction of a peacekeeping operation) to efforts to resolve the core issues in a dispute which has erupted. No one minimized the difficulty of peacemaking. Inherent in preventive peacemaking is the fact that failure is more apparent than success. When such peacemaking is successful and open hostilities are prevented, few may recognize the success. Only if fighting begins is the failure of peacemaking noted, and at that point no one willingly accepts blame.

In cases where hostilities have already broken out and where mediation has brought about a cease-fire and introduction of a peacekeeping force, there is often more interest in the peacekeeping operation than in carrying on the peacemaking. Interest in settling the issues that are at the core of the dispute often wanes. In some situations ending the fighting may be regarded as success enough. Armed conflict often involves border disputes or issues that have been contested for generations, and such issues may not be ready for settlement for a long time. Simply keeping disputants separated may be the most to be expected.

Given these restraints, what can be done to increase the likelihood of using the United Nations' peacemaking potential? Many participants supported an emphasis on prevention. Early intervention could prevent disputes from erupting into open conflict. Although that sounds very good, such an approach is not without problems. The United Nations must walk a fine line: it must wait to be invited into a dispute situation or find ways to be invited. A preventive approach would require naming the parties and issues involved in a potential dispute. Many nations would greatly resent such an intrusion. Such an approach could actually backfire--making nations less interested in approaching the United Nations.

Participants also encouraged a more assertive stance by the Security Council. There was consensus that the five permanent members have a special responsibility in the area of peacemaking. When those nations work together, things happen. The Security Council should not back away from using its potential to assist in bringing about the end of fighting and convincing nations to resolve disputes peacefully. (Some suggested that the council could have brought more pressure to bear on Iran and Iraq to accept Resolution 598 earlier than they did.) Participants noted the great importance of a close working relationship between the Security Council and the Secretary-General and recognized the

significance and usefulness of informal consultations toward this end. One participant also suggested that the Security Council consider meeting at the foreign minister level once a year. At that time the ministers could discuss the state of the world and review current and potential peacemaking and peacekeeping needs. This would be yet another way to focus attention on the United Nations' peacemaking potential.

Much credit for the United Nations' success in peacemaking goes to the Secretary-General, himself, and the exercise of the Good Offices role. Participants were lavish in their appreciation for the work of the last year. It was also noted that the Secretary-General's office is significantly understaffed. More hands would do much to make the work lighter and more effective. As is the case in most organizations of any size, the flow of information to and from the Secretary-General's office can be, and often is, a problem. The difficulty lies in getting the right information in the right form to the right person. Regrettably, often too much information is in an unusable form.

Participants also agreed that needed information exists within the United Nations but that getting objective analyses of data or research are difficult. A potential conflict occurs when someone working in the Secretariat gives analysis of a situation involving his or her country, for example, a US national analyzing the situation in Central America.

Another problem associated with the flow of information results from the very nature of peacemaking. For peacemaking to be successful, it must often be done very quietly. This requires that only a limited number of people be informed. That very fact mitigates against going through the normal channels of information gathering and data analysis in a large bureaucracy.

Participants were emphatic in their support of a continued active peacemaking role for the Secretary-General and his office. Some went so far as to suggest that he be given the authority to convene the Security Council and to establish observer forces to monitor potential conflict situations. However, most felt that his role and authority should stay as they are but that the Secretary-General should be encouraged to continue in his practice of finding ways to bring conflicts to a peaceful resolution.

Peacekeeping

When the first stages of peacemaking have been successful, a peacekeeping operation is often deployed. Peacekeeping has long been regarded as one of the most successful functions of the United Nations and, in the past twelve to eighteen months, recognition of its utility has increased. Besides four new operations being mounted in the past year, UN peacekeeping forces were awarded the Nobel Prize for Peace in 1988. Yet a number of problems associated with peacekeeping require attention.

Participants were somewhat divided over whether the operational aspects of peacekeeping just need some fine-tuning or whether something more comprehensive is in order. Those who lean toward an overhaul want serious consideration of such things as:

- -revitalization of the Military Staff Committee (MSC),
- -reexamination of the special accounts formula for funding peacekeeping (which has been used in all but one case since 1973),
- -pressing toward a principle of universality in participation in peacekeeping operations,
- -use of the United Nations' Committee of 34 to set guidelines for peacekeeping operations.[1]

Those who argue for fine-tuning say, "If it ain't broke, don't fix it." In general, they note that each peacekeeping operation is unique and that creating universal rules is ill-advised if not dangerous. They acknowledge problems in financing which need attention but would not press hard for changing participation in peacekeeping forces, and they would have the Committee of 34 focus its efforts on "practical measures" aimed at improving peacekeeping efficiency.

Defining Peacekeeping

Determining when a United Nations' operation is "peacekeeping" is important for political and technical reasons. As one participant explained, the United Nations has operations that range

[1] The Committee of 34 (originally 33) was set up after the Congo operation in the 1960s to look at problems associated with financing peacekeeping. Its mission was later expanded to consider guidelines for peacekeeping operations. However, many countries have resisted such guidelines. The committee did not meet from 1983 to 1988, but it has recently been reactivated and expanded to include China.

from the placement of armed forces standing between warring armies on one end of the scale to the observation of plebiscites on the other end. Where along that line does peacekeeping begin? Some suggested that the use of military personnel in the operations should be the determinant. However, others said additional criteria should be applied, including:

-the number of people involved
-the amount of time spent on location
-the mandate or mission assigned to the participants (For example, it was suggested that observers should not try to influence the situation where, by contrast, a military contingent may be trying to affect the situation by keeping combatants separated.)
-the source of the mandate, i.e., who authorized the operation (The technical importance of the source of the mandate resides in questions about who pays for the operation, on what scale of assessments, and who within the United Nations organizes it.)

There is also **political** importance in who authorized an operation. More significance is attached to the deployment of a Security Council-mandated mission than to the Secretary-General's dispatch of a fact-finding contingent. At the same time, it is important for the Secretary-General to know how far he can go in deploying a mission when he is operating strictly in his Good Offices capacity and without a specific Security Council mandate. For example, it was noted that in Afghanistan consideration was given to the interjection of a mission to monitor compliance with the Geneva Accords strictly on the Secretary-General's authority. It later turned out to be more politically prudent to obtain a Security Council mandate for what is now called the United Nations' Good Offices Mission in Afghanistan and Pakistan (UNGOMAP).

Several participants noted that the best practice is for the Secretary-General to consult frequently with Security Council members on an informal basis to keep them apprised of his actions. In fact, such consultations are now going on regularly, and the relationship between the Secretary-General and the Security Council is quite good at this time. That has helped the United Nations achieve some of its successes of the past year.

Financing

Throughout its history, several different methods have been used to pay for peacekeeping operations. Some of the oldest are financed from the United Nations' regular budget; that is also the

method of financing for UNGOMAP. The operation in Cyprus (UNFICYP) is paid with voluntary contributions, an approach which has been disastrous because contributions have been extremely slow in coming. All other operations which have begun since 1973 are financed through special accounts established for each operation. The scale of assessments used for the special accounts is different from that used for the regular budget. The special accounts draw a higher share from the permanent members of the Security Council (nearly 58 percent of the cost is covered by these five countries), assess other industrialized nations at their regular budget rate, and tax developing countries at a lower than normal rate. This special scale of assessments was agreed to by member states in 1973 after much controversy in the preceding decade spurred largely by the United Nations' operation in the Congo in the early 1960s.

Many nations are behind in their payments for peacekeeping and many others routinely pay their peacekeeping assessments late. This has left most of the special accounts in arrears; and, as a consequence, the United Nations is behind in making payments to troop-contributing countries for the services of their soldiers. Some withholding of payment for peacekeeping operations is for political reasons; others stem from inability to pay.

Several participants suggested that the 1973 consensus on how costs should be shared may be about to break down. Some of the major powers feel the formula places too heavy a burden on them; developing countries respond by saying that it is not too much to ask that big powers pay a price for their power and prestige. However, some larger powers claim the formula does not reflect the economic growth that has occurred in some of the newly industrialized countries which are still assessed at a low rate.

Argument over that issue aside, some participants suggested that nations may be losing their will to support large-scale operations in places like the Western Sahara where few members of the international community have direct interest in events in the region. However, one participant noted the willingness of the UN membership to support a large operation in a fairly remote place like Namibia speaks well for the commitment of the international community to peacekeeping endeavors.[2]

---

[2]As this conference was meeting, the General Assembly was still negotiating the appropriation for the United Nations Transistion Assistance Group (UNTAG).

Another danger put before the group was that some troop-contributing countries may lose patience with the United Nations' inability to pay or to be late in payment. One participant from a troop-contributing country noted that it is unreasonable to think that the current troop-contributors will go on supplying forces for large, new operations when the United Nations is as far behind as eight years in payment for some operations.

The problems associated with the financing of peacekeeping operations have prompted the General Assembly to request that the Secretary-General prepare a report laying out some options on these issues. That report is to be presented to the 44th General Assembly. A few participants offered specific suggestions relating to financing of peacekeeping:

- Create a kind of insurance fund that is established in advance to pay for the operations. Nations would pay in to have the service available when needed. This could be accompanied by a practice of assessing those nations which benefit from the services. For example, Iran and Iraq might be required to make sizable payments to such a fund after they have restored their economies. (While this might seem costly, one participant said that if nations can afford to conduct a war it is not unreasonable to expect them to pay for peace efforts.)

- A similar but less ambitious plan would be to create a working capital fund dedicated to peacekeeping operations which could be drawn on to start a force.

- Look seriously at closing down some of the oldest operations which date back forty years. As one participant said, "We can't just go on creating new forces and keeping the old ones going forever as well."

Force Composition and Planning Responsibility

Peacekeeping operations that have been mounted to date have been planned, organized, and commanded from within the UN Secretariat. While many countries have contributed troops, there are several which train troops specifically for peacekeeping operations and which regularly contribute large numbers. These include the Nordic countries, Canada, Austria, and Fiji.

Some participants argued that the MSC (comprised of military leaders from the five permanent members of the Security Council)

should be revitalized and given a role in planning and organizing peacekeeping operations. It was noted that the Charter assigns special responsibility for maintaining peace and security to these five members and setting up other channels for peacekeeping operations runs counter to the Charter. As one participant said, "Having special responsibilities should mean something other than that the five powers pay more for peacekeeping."

Most participants saw great potential harm in interposing the MSC in peacekeeping operations. They said it runs counter to the experience of the past forty years. The MSC has never functioned as expected because of the deep divisions among the five permanent members. Peacekeeping operations have been very successfully done without the MSC's influence. Several participants noted that much of the world gets nervous when the five major powers decide to act together and that would be especially true if a direct military component were involved. Furthermore, involving the Security Council through the MSC in the direction of peacekeeping operations possibly opens the door to use of the veto in operational aspects of a force, making the command process cumbersome at best and quite possibly politically colored.

Discussion was also held on the composition of the forces. For the most part, troops from major powers have traditionally had little involvement in peacekeeping operations usually because their interests are so wide-ranging and they are not seen as neutral. It has also been the case that one of the nations involved in a dispute can effectively veto the presence of forces from a country which it mistrusts. For example, South Africa refuses to permit Swedish forces in UNTAG.

Some participants said that these practices run counter to the principle of universality of participation--i.e., troops from any nation should not be automatically excluded. The United Nations should be able to decide which forces it wants to use without these political constraints. Most participants said that while the principle of universality of participation is good, it should not be pressed. For the most part, keeping major power forces out and eliminating a potentially inflammatory presence has served the general purpose of peacekeeping well. The practical politics of the situation should not be ignored. Again, using the UNTAG example, South Africa controls the Namibian territory and can effectively bar Swedish participation in any event.

While discussions revealed some differences among participants

on issues relating to peacekeeping, the divisions have not proven to be so deep that they cripple support for new operations. There were different approaches to improving peacekeeping, but there is general agreement that the operations have been successful and should not be radically altered.

Future Role

Participants were asked to look at what role the United Nations might play in peacemaking and peacekeeping in the years ahead. Among the ideas put forward:

- There will be an increased use of peacekeeping forces and nations will become uncomfortable with that, especially the costs.

- One of the potential growth areas for the United Nations is in prevention of conflict and early warning about potential conflict. The difficulty in this area is that questions of sovereignty can quickly come into play.

- The United Nations might play a useful role in issues relating to the protection of diplomats and citizens who are travelling internationally.

- Thought should be given to the responsibility of the international community to respond to massive human rights violations within a country. Situations in Cambodia and Uganda were mentioned as specific examples. The Charter does not provide for intervention into internal situations, but it was suggested that thought be given to establishing some kind of trigger mechanism that would evoke an international response when massive human rights abuses are generally known to be occurring.

- Two notes of caution were sounded. First, it has come to be expected that every peacekeeping mission which is launched will succeed. However, as more and more of these operations are carried out the risk of a major failure increases. It is hoped that there will not be an overreaction to the first failure and an abandonment of the processes which have proved successful. Also, attention was called to the changing technology of warfare. This could require that new forms of peacekeeping operations be developed, and the international community should begin to prepare for that.

Conclusion

The successes of the past year contributed to a hope among these participants that the great potential that lies in international cooperation in the peace and security area might come a little closer to being realized. These successes should be the foundation for increased confidence in the international system. Eventually, peaceful resolution of disputes should become the norm of international behavior. In the words of one participant, "The hope is that you get to the point where it's odd not to have a dispute dealt with rather than that we get euphoric about having done a few things. You want to create a standard where nations isolate combatants that don't use international organizations."

For continued progress to be made, it was noted repeatedly, there must be consolidation of the improved political atmosphere of the recent past. Peacemaking requires skilled personnel supported with timely information blessed with accommodating conditions. Participants agreed that efforts should be made to bring those three elements together. Presently no hard and fast guidelines exist for peacemaking or peacekeeping. Each situation is unique and demands its own approach, and that is good. Making UN peacemaking and peacekeeping as approachable and appealing as possible is likely to increase demands for its use.

At the same time the problems in mounting an international response to new opportunities will also have to be met. As the discussions highlighted, there are differences over how best to adjust to a new and expanded role for the United Nations. However, the divisions are not deep and the problems should not be seen as intractable in light of recent successes and the potential for more.

Chairman's Observations

Conference discussions encouraged me on progress in the United Nations' role in peacemaking and peacekeeping and strengthened my conviction of its value. While participants expressed differences over how to gear up for a larger UN role, these should not be exaggerated. In general, the participants at this conference are very positive about UN peacemaking and peacekeeping. Their differences are over details. They think peacemaking and peacekeeping have worked well and should be further developed, not tampered with.

While the costs of UN peacekeeping operations are rising dramatically, it is all too easy to lose perspective. Peacemaking and peacekeeping are bargains compared to the costs of war and to high levels of military expenditure to deter war. This is clear in financial costs alone, without even considering the human costs.

It seems most equitable and workable to apportion the costs of peacekeeping on the general principle of ability to pay. That means a scale of assessments that resembles the present Special Account Scale or the Regular Scale of Assessment. There may be a good case for tinkering with one or both of these, but radically different approaches, such as the idea of trying to assess the costs of peacekeeping to the countries that have been at war, seem unworkable.

Regardless of details of the assessment, nations need to be more reliable and timely in meeting their financial obligations. It is unconscionable to expect the nations who furnish peacekeeping forces to continue to finance the shortfall in revenues. Paying for peacekeeping is part of the dues of being a responsible member of the international community. Further, it can be viewed as a kind of insurance premium against the time when UN peacekeeping might serve vital national interests. For example, while the United States is not likely to need peacekeepers stationed between it and its neighbors, there is little doubt that some current peacekeeping operations, such as in the Middle East, serve important US interests.

Nations and international institutions need to affirm and solidify peacemaking as the norm for international dispute resolution.

Among other steps, attention should be given to:

- Building the United Nations' ability to function as mediator, including staff development for this role.

- New thinking at high government levels about how national interests are best served. Government should make hard-headed assessments of the costs of war measured against alternative means of conflict resolution.

- Considering an enhanced role for the International Court of Justice on issues that lend themselves to an adjudicated solution. For example, one of the disputes between Iran and Iraq involves a long-standing border disagreement which is not closer to resolution after eight years of fighting. Serious consideration should be given to submitting issues of this kind to a panel of jurists for final decision.

I am concerned that the foundation for an enhanced role for the United Nations in peacemaking and peacekeeping may be fragile. At present, much depends on continuing cooperation among the five permanent members of the Security Council, and that cooperation has been tenuous at best over the past forty-four years. But the foundation will be strengthened to the extent those nations recognize the positive results of the past year and understand that their own long-term security is enhanced by cooperation on immediate issues to make the world more peaceful.

The Stanley Foundation

Activities

The Stanley Foundation works toward the goal of a secure peace with freedom and justice by encouraging study, research, and discussion of international issues. Programs strive to enhance individual awareness and commitment and to affect public policy.

International conferences for diplomats, scholars, businessmen, and public officials comprise a major portion of foundation activities. Other foundation activities include an extensive citizen education program which provides support and programming for educators, young people, churches, professional and service groups, and nonprofit organizations and offers planning assistance and resource people for collaborative events; production of *Common Ground*, a weekly world affairs radio series; and sponsorship of the monthly magazine, *World Press Review*. Individual copies of conference reports are distributed free of charge. Multiple copies of publications and cassette recordings of *Common Ground* programs are available at a nominal cost. A complete list of activities, publications, and cassettes is available.

The Stanley Foundation, a private operating foundation, welcomes gifts from supportive friends. All programming is internally planned and administered; the foundation is not a grant-making institution.

UN-Related Publications

International Agenda for the 1990s, Report of the Twenty-third United Nations of the Next Decade Conference, July 1988, 36 pp.

Science and Technology for Development, Report of the Nineteenth United Nations Issues Conference, February 1988, 32 pp.

The United Nations and the Future of Internationalism, Report of the Twenty-second United Nations of the Next Decade Conference, June 1987, 32 pp.

Single copies are available free. There is a small postage and handling charge for multiple copies or bulk orders. For more information contact the publications manager.

The Stanley Foundation
420 East Third Street
Muscatine, Iowa 52761 USA
Telephone 319/264-1500

Production: Kathy Christensen, Mary Gray, Margo Schneider